Transportation

ELDERLY RESIDENTS IN ONTARIO

86-02342/

ELDERLY RESIDENTS IN ONTARIO:

THEIR USE OF TRANSPORTATION

Minister for Senior Citizens Affairs
Seniors Secretariat
September, 1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is part of a series on the USCO project. The study has involved a variety of individuals, groups and government departments at many levels. The eclectic nature of the study necessitated a variety of resources and it is apparent that the study has benefitted from such support.

A special thank you to the United Senior Citizens of Ontario, specifically to their Research Task Force. They conceived the initial idea and provided assistance in the field co-ordination. Reg Screen and Joyce King (USCO past President and President respectively) must be singled out for their dedication and consistent and continuous support.

Thanks are due to New Horizons of Health and Welfare, Canada. They provided the USCO with the grant to fund the project. The Income Security Branch of Health and Welfare Canada, must also be remembered for the provision of the Old Age Security data base from which the sample was drawn.

One hundred and twelve volunteers were recruited to do the interviews. Many thanks to these individuals who contributed so generously of their time.

The project began under the direction of Anna Rose Spina in the former Program Development Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Health. Stephen Newroth served as the project co-ordinator to the completion of the fieldwork. Merle Anne Ridley was my co-worker during the fieldwork and the initial stages of analysis. She also assisted me with writing the papers on the methodology, income group differences and rural-urban differences.

Anne Madigan, formerly with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, co-ordinated the fieldwork in the rural areas.

I am very grateful to the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development for funding the analysis and report writing stages. Their support has been extremely significant. Particular thanks to the Inter-Ministry Steering Committee with whom I am working: John Nywening, (Chairperson) and David Kennedy, Seniors Secretariat; George Hough, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Dorothy Singer, Ministry of Community and Social Services; Joan McCalla and John Thorpe, Ministry of Transportation and Communications; and Esta Wall, Ministry of Health.

My many thanks to Millie Oake for her careful typing of this manuscript.

Finally, this study could never have been accomplished without the co-operation of the 846 persons whom we interviewed. I only hope that this study sensitively and accurately represents their experience.

Arlene Hoffman, Ph.D.
Research Consultant

SUMMARY

The focus of this report is on the use of transportation by the 846 persons interviewed for the USCO survey. The paper focuses on (a) the type of transportation used by the respondents to go shopping, to get to medical appointments and social occasions (b) the problems associated with these transportation modes (c) the use of public transportation and taxis and (d) the use of additional income on transportation.

The findings of the study revealed that the largest proportion (at least 40%) of respondents drove themselves when going shopping, to medical appointments or to social occasions. The use of public transportation to these activities varied from a low of eight percent (shopping) to a high of eighteen percent (social occasions). The type of transportation used differed considerably across areas. Residents of Penetanguishene/ Brockville were most likely to drive to each of these activities. Residents of Toronto made the greatest use of public transportation. Across areas community agencies were relied on minimally.

Nine percent of the total sample reported problems with transportation. The number of persons reporting problems differed across areas. The most frequent problems were cited by residents of Penetanguishene/Brockville (13%) and the least frequent problems were reported by residents of Sault Ste Marie/Windsor (5%). Transportation problems were reported most frequently by women, by widowed respondents and by persons with a greater number of interfering health conditions.

The transportation problem identified most often and by more than one-half of the respondents was the absence of persons who could be called upon if a ride was needed. Problems also frequently cited were the inconvenience of public transportation and the dislike of dependency on other persons.

Nineteen percent of the respondents said they could use additional assistance with transportation. The majority (86%) of these persons wanted an accompanying individual; fourteen percent expressed a desire for financial assistance.

Slightly over ten percent of the respondents complained that their residence was located too far from transportation. The persons who voiced this complaint comprised 21% of the respondents in the rural communities, eight percent of the residents in Sault Ste Marie/Windsor and five percent of Toronto's residents.

Close to one-third of the respondents said that should additional income be available to them, they would spend it on transportation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
SUMMARY	ii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION USED FOR SHOPPING, MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS AND SOCIAL OCCASIONS	2
2.1 Shopping	2
2.2 Medical Appointments	2
2.3 Social Occasions	3
3. PROBLEMS WITH TRANSPORTATION	3
4. USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND TAXIS	5
5. LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS' RESIDENCE IN RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSPORTATION	7
6. THE USE OF ADDITIONAL INCOME ON TRANSPORTATION	7
7. CONCLUSION	7
APPENDICES	
Tables	9
Other Papers in the USCO Series	26
Glossary	28
References	33

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By The Two Modes Of Transportation Used To Go Shopping	9
2	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By The First Mode Of Transportation Used To Go Shopping By Area	10
3	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By The Two Modes Of Transportation Used To Get To Medical Appointments	11
4	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By The First Mode Of Transportation Used To Get To Medical Appointments By Area	12
5	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By The Two Modes Of Transportation Used To Go To Social Occasions	13
6	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By The First Mode Of Transportation Used To Go To Social Occasions By Area	14
7	Number And Percentage Of Respondents Reporting Transportation Problems By Area	15
8	Type Of Transportation Problems Expressed By Respondents With Respect To Going Shopping, Going To Medical Appointments And Going To Social Occasions (Number & Percentage)	16
9	Number Of Interfering Health Conditions Reported By Respondents By Their Problems With Transportation (Number & Percentage)	17
10	Marital Status Of Respondents By Their Problems With Transportation By Area (Number & Percentage)	18
11	Reasons For Not Using Public Transportation By Area (Number And Percentage)	19
12	Sex Of Respondents By Their Use Of Public Transportation (Number & Percentage)	20
13	Marital Status of Respondents By Their Use of Public Transportation (Number & Percentage)	21

Table **Page**

14 Number And Percentage Of Respondents Who Report That The Location Of Their Residence Is Too Distant From Transportation By Area..... 22

15 Age Group Of Respondents By Their Willingness To Spend Additional Income On Transportation (Number & Percentage) 23

16 Sex Of Respondents By Their Willingness To Spend Additional Income On Transportation (Number & Percentage) 24

17 Marital Status Of Respondents By Their Willingness To Spend Additional Income On Transportation (Number & Percentage) 25

INTRODUCTION

This paper is part of a series on the findings of the United Senior Citizens of Ontario survey[1]. The principal objective of the survey was to systematically examine the living situation of persons 62 years of age and older who reside in the community and outside of institutional settings. In this survey a scientific random sample of 846 persons was interviewed from eight areas across the Province. The areas included five urban centres: Brockville, Penetanguishene, Sault Ste. Marie, Toronto and Windsor, and three rural communities: Athens, Bruce Mines and Cookstown.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the types (or mode) of transportation used by the respondents, and the problems that are associated in using these modes. The paper focuses on:

(a) the most frequent modes of transportation used to go shopping, to get to medical appointments and social occasions.

(b) the problems associated with these transportation modes.

(c) the use of public transportation and taxis.

(d) the use of additional income on transportation.

The significance of transportation for older persons has been discussed by a number of gerontologists. Atchley (1977) and Cutler (1978) suggest that transportation is the mediator between older persons and their environment. As such, when transportation problems restrict the older persons' mobility, they may suffer from constricted life space and low levels of life satisfacation (Cutler). Carp (1977) maintains that the value of transportation for older persons transcends that which is personal to that which is societal. Her argument is based on the premise that transportation has an economic value to society in that it's adequacy is supportive of the older person's ability to remain within their own home and outside of institutional settings.

The factors related to adequate transportation are undoubtedly many and may include location of residence, health status, age, income, ethnic background, social network, marital status, sex, etc. This paper will examine the role of these factors in the transportation experiences of older community residents in Ontario.

---

1 Refer to the Appendix for a list of other papers in this series.

2. TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION USED FOR SHOPPING, MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS AND SOCIAL OCCASIONS

Information was gathered on the type of transportation used by the respondents for shopping, medical appointments and social occasions. Transportation to these activities were scrutinized with the belief that participation in these activities is common to the experiences of most older persons. The two most frequent modes of transportation used for each activity were recorded. The discussion that follows considers the activities separately.

2.1 Shopping

Table I illustrates the two principal types of transportation used by the total sample to go shopping. The modes are ordered in terms of frequency of use. The mode relied on most frequently is defined as the first mode. An analysis of the first mode of transportation used for shopping, reveals that the largest proportion of respondents (43%, n=346) drove themselves. Twenty-six percent (n=208) were driven by others (spouse, relations or friends); twenty percent (n=165) walked; eight percent (n=66) used public transportation [1] and one percent (n=4) used the services of a community agency.

Some notable differences were found across areas in the most frequently used form of transportation for shopping. Table 2 shows that residents of Penetanguishene/Brockville (54%, n=77) were more likely to drive themselves shopping than the residents in any of the remaining communities. Residents of Toronto (29%, n=72) were least likely to drive themselves and most likely to use public transit. No differences among areas were found in the use of community agencies.

Forty-three percent (n=364) of the total sample indicated a second mode of transportation or an alternate means of transportation for shopping. Forty-one percent (n=149) were driven by others; 21% (n=76) used public transportation; seventeen percent (n=62) walked and one percent (n=4) used community services.

2.2 Medical Appointments

Table 3 illustrates the means of transportation used for medical appointments. With respect to the first mode, forty percent (n=329) of the respondents drove themselves. Slightly over ten percent walked (13%, n=110), were driven by their spouse (11%, n=86), were driven by relatives (14%, n=113), or made use of public transportation (14%, n=111).

---

[1] Public transportation refers to any mode of transportation owned by the municipality, province or federal government.

Two percent (n=13) called on community agencies. As an alternate or second mode, the respondents were equally divided between those who relied on public transportation (21%, n=68) and those who were driven by relatives (21%, n=67). Sixteen percent (n=52) used taxis and three percent (n=8) used the services of community agencies.

Some differences among areas were identified in the primary mode of transportation used. Table 4 shows that in Penetanguishene/Brockville (52%, n=76), in the rural communities (48%, n=76) and in Sault Ste Marie/Windsor (43%, n=112), the largest proportion of respondents drove themselves to medical appointments. In Toronto the largest proportion (27%, n=69) used public transportation.

2.3 Social Occasions

As the primary mode of transportation to social occasions, almost one-half (46%, n=326) of the respondents drove themselves. Table 5 illustrates that ten percent (n=75) used public transportation and one percent (n=2) used community agencies. For the second mode, almost one-fifth (n=53) were driven by relatives and an almost equal proportion (18%, n=52) sought public transportation. One percent (n=3) used community agencies.

Differences across areas are depicted on Table 6. Although the largest proportion of respondents in each of the areas drove themselves to social occasions, the proportion of drivers varied considerably among areas from a low of 33% (n=75) in Toronto to a high of 59% (n=70) in Pentanguishene/Brockville. Use of public transportation varied as well and ranged from one percent (n=1) in the rural areas to 23% (n=54) in Toronto. Community agencies were relied on minimally in all areas (approximately one percent).

3. PROBLEMS WITH TRANSPORTATION

The respondents were asked to indicate if transportation presented any problems when getting to the activities discussed above. The proportion of respondents to identify problems was six percent (n=44 - shopping) five percent (n=40 - medical appointments) and five percent (n=34 - social occasions).

The number of respondents reporting transportation problems differed across areas. Table 7 illustrates that irrespective of the activity, transportation problems were more common in Penetanguishene/Brockville and Toronto than in the rural areas or Sault Ste. Marie/Windsor.

The problem reported most frequently and by more than half of the respondents was the absence of persons who could be called upon for a ride. See Table 8. Problems also frequently cited were the inconvenience of public transportation and the dislike of dependency on other persons. Less than ten percent of the respondents reported problems associated with the expense of transportation or the inability to use public transportation.

The respondents who reported one or more transportation problems totalled nine percent (n=76). By area, the number of persons reporting problems was as follows:

	(N)	%
Penetanguishene/Brockville	(19)	13
Cookstown/Athens/Bruce Mines	(13)	8
Sault Ste. Marie/Windsor	(12)	5
Toronto	(32)	12

The age, sex, number of children, number of interfering health conditions, marital status, ethnic background and income of the respondents who reported transportation problems were analyzed. The significant discriminating factors were number of interfering health conditions, sex and marital status.

Table 9 illustrates that transportation problems were more likely to be reported by the respondents with a greater number of interfering health conditions. Transporation problems were reported by three percent (n=7) of the persons without interfering health conditions compared to 26% (n=29) of those with six or more interfering conditions.

Women (13%, n=62) more often than men (3%, n=12) identified transportation problems. As well, problems with transportation were cited by single and widowed respondents more often than married or divorced/separated respondents. Table 10 illustrates that fourteen percent (n=8) of the single respondents, fifteen percent (n=5) of the divorced/separated respondents and seven percent (n=32) of those who were married reported transportation problems.

Irrespective of whether the respondents indicated transportation problems, they were asked to respond to the question..."If you could get further assistance with transportation, would you be interested in having the assistance?" Almost one-fifth (19%, n=155) of the respondents answered in the affirmative and specified the type of assistance they wanted. Thirty-five percent (n=52) wanted the assistance of an accompanying individual when travelling by public or private transportation. Thirty-five percent (n=54) wanted a transportation service that would pick them up at their home. A further 31% (n=45) expressed a desire for financial assistance with taxis.

4. USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND TAXIS

A series of questions focused on the respondents' general use of public transportation and taxis. Fifty percent (n=425) of the total sample reported using public transportation. Shown below is the number of public transportation users by area:

	(N)	%
Penetanguishene/Brockville	(35)	24
Cookstown/Athens/Bruce Mines	(55)	33
Sault Ste Marie/Windsor	(113)	44
Toronto	(215)	81

Toronto residents were most likely users of public transportation. The least likely users resided in Penetanguishene/Brockville.

Those who used public transportation generally travelled without any assistance. However, five percent of the respondents reported using the assistance of another person all of the time and nine percent (n=37) stated they used the assistance of another individual some of the time.

When asked if they required any assistance when travelling by public transportation, three percent (n=14) of the respondents answered in the affirmative. The majority (86%, n=12) of these persons said they needed the assistance of an accompanying individual. Fourteen percent (n=2) expressed a desire for financial assistance.

The respondents who did not use public transportation were asked for the reason. Sixty-nine percent (n=283) of the non-users stated they had no need for it; one percent (n=5) said it was too expensive; four percent (n=17) said it was not conveniently located; six percent (n=24) stated they needed personal assistance and did not have it; thirteen percent (n=54) said there was no public transportation in their area and seven percent (n=28) said they were unable to use it.

The reasons for not using public transportation differed somewhat by area. They are depicted on Table 11. The absence of need, the most common reason for not using public transportation, was expressed by 56% (n=27) of Toronto's residents compared to 86% (n=116) of residents in Sault Ste. Marie/Windsor. A problem cited frequently (close to 25% of respondents) in the areas of Penetanguishene/Brockville and Cookstown/Athens/Bruce Mines was the unavailability of public transportation. In Toronto, more than in any other area, respondents reported the absence of an individual to accompany them when travelling.

The characteristics of the public transportation users were analyzed. Differences in number of interfering health conditions, age, sex, ethnic background and income were examined. The significant discriminating factors were sex and marital status. Table 12 illustrates that women (57%, n=270) were more frequent users of public transportation than men (42%, n=146). Widowed (60%, n=163) and single (73%, n=44) persons were also the more frequent users of public transportation. Less than one-half (41%, n=192) of the married respondents used public transit. See Table 13.

Taxis were used less often than public transportation. Thirty-two percent (n=272) of the total sample used taxis, with the proportion differing by area:

	(N)	%
Penetanguishene/Brockville	(55)	37
Cookstown/Athens/Bruce Mines	(150)	9
Saulte Ste. Marie/Windsor	(84)	33
Toronto	(116)	44

Toronto residents were the most frequent users of taxis and as expected, residents in the rural communities used taxis least frequently.

Among the taxis users, seven percent (n=20) said they used the assistance of another individual all of the time; eighteen percent (n=48) reported using the assistance of an accompanying individual some of the time. It is noteworthy that six percent (n=15) of those who reported travelling by taxis said they could use further assistance. Fifty-five percent (n=6) wanted financial assistance and 45% (n=5) wanted an accompanying individual. These findings should be regarded with caution in light of the small numbers in these categories.

Of the persons who did not use taxis (68%, n=563), 71% (n=402) said they had no need for them; fifteen percent (n=86) said taxis were too expensive; ten percent (n=59) said they were physically unable to use them; two percent (n=7) said they did not have access to an accompanying individual and a further two percent (n=9) reported that taxis were not conveniently located.

5. LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS' RESIDENCE IN RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSPORTATION

Eleven percent (n=92) of the respondents complained that their residence was located too far from transportation. Table 14 illustrates that the largest proportion (21%, n=36) of these respondents resided in the rural communities; eight percent (n=19) resided in Sault Ste. Marie/Windsor and five percent (n=14) were residents of Toronto.

6. THE USE OF ADDITIONAL INCOME ON TRANSPORTATION

The interviewees were asked to respond to the question: "If you had additional income, would you spend it on transportation or a new car...?" Almost one-third (32%, n=259) of the respondents said they would spend additional income on transportation and an additional five percent (n=41) said they might. No significant differences were found across areas in the responses. The responses did, however, differ across age groups, sex and marital status. Factors including income, ethnic background, education and health status did not discriminate among groups. Tables 15 through 17 show that the persons most likely to spend additional income on transportation were between the ages of 62 and 74 (37%, n=179), were men (36%, n=122) and were divorced/separated (46%, n=15) or married (35%, n=158).

7. CONCLUSION

This paper examined the use of transportation by the 846 persons interviewed for the U.S.C.O. survey. The principal focus of this paper was on the basic type of transportation used and associated problems.

An accumulating body of gerontological literature has pointed to the implications of transportation for the older persons' quality of life. Cutler (1978) reports:

> ...A major and long-standing research interest among gerontologists has been in variables such as social activity, social interaction, and various facets of psychological well-being. From the consistent and accumulating evidence, there is no escaping the conclusion that transportation is a factor of demonstrable importance in these and other areas (p. 230)

In recognition of the potential significance of transportation, the transportation experiences of the respondents in the USCO survey were addressed.

The survey produced a number of significant findings and documentation that can serve as the basis for further research. The study highlighted the large number of respondents who depend on their own driving for transportation or on the assistance of friends/relatives. The study also pointed out the differing proportions of respondents across areas who identified transportation problems. It is significant to note that the respondents residing in Toronto and Penetanguishene/Brockville were the most likely to report transportation problems. Residents of Sault Ste. Marie/Windsor reported transportation problems least often.

It is noteworthy that the type of transportation problems reported did not pertain to individual problems of driving. Rather, the problems identified in largest proportion, related to the absence of individuals who could be asked for a ride. The cost of transportation was not regarded as a critical problem by the majority of respondents.

The findings presented describe the transportation habits and problems of 846 older persons in eight communities across Ontario. The majority (91%) of the respondents reported no transportation problems. Nine percent, however did. To more completely understand the transportation problems expressed, the problems should be examined in juxtaposition with available programs and/or services. Documentation is yet required of the existence of transportation services by community, the structure of the services, the knowledge older persons have of the services and the accessibility and the affordability of the services.

Adequate transportation is a critical enabling factor to the maintenance of independence for older persons. It is a facilitating factor in the integration of older persons into society and into the use of its resources. To be successful, transportation must not only be carefully engineered, but must provide access to places older persons want to go in ways that are comfortable, convenient and dignified.

TABLE 1: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE TWO MODES OF TRANSPORTATION USED TO GO SHOPPING

	FIRST MODE (N)	FIRST MODE %	SECOND MODE (N)	SECOND MODE %
Walk	(165)	20	(62)	17
Drive Self	(346)	43	(42)	11
Driven by Spouse	(89)	11	(43)	12
Driven by Relatives	(101)	13	(74)	20
Driven by Friends	(18)	2	(32)	9
Taxi	(16)	2	(31)	9
Public Transportation	(66)	8	(76)	21
Community Agency	(4)	1	(4)	1
TOTAL	(805)*	100	(364)*	100

*41 Missing Cases

*482 Persons Indicated Only One Mode of Transportation

TABLE 2: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE FIRST MODE OF TRANSPORTATION USED TO GO SHOPPING BY AREA

	PENETANG/BROCKVILLE		COOKS/ATH/BRUCE MINES		S.S. MARIE/WINDSOR		TORONTO	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Walk	(22)	15	(30)	19	(26)	10	(87)	34
Drive Self	(77)	54	(80)	50	(117)	47	(72)	29
Driven by Spouse	(20)	14	(17)	11	(25)	10	(27)	11
Driven by Relatives	(15)	11	(25)	16	(41)	16	(20)	8
Driven by Friends	(2)	1	(6)	3	(7)	3	(3)	1
Taxi	(6)	4	-	-	(7)	3	(3)	1
Public Transportation	-	-	(1)	1	(27)	10	(38)	15
Community Agency	(1)	1	-	-	(1)	1	(2)	1
TOTAL	(143)*	100	(159)**	100	(251)***	100	(252)****	100

*5 Missing Observations, **9 Missing Observations, ***14 Missing Observations, ****13 Missing Observations

TABLE 3: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE TWO MODES OF TRANSPORTATION USED TO GET TO MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS

	FIRST MODE (N)	FIRST MODE %	SECOND MODE (N)	SECOND MODE %
Walk	(110)	13	(31)	10
Drive Self	(329)	40	(33)	10
Driven by Spouse	(86)	11	(39)	12
Driven by Relatives	(113)	14	(67)	21
Driven by Friends	(20)	2	(22)	7
Taxi	(36)	4	(52)	16
Public Transportation	(111)	14	(68)	21
Community Agency	(13)	2	(8)	3
TOTAL	(818)*	100	(320)**	100

*28 Missing Observations

**4 Missing Observations

522 People Indicated Only One Mode of Transportation

TABLE 4: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE FIRST MODE OF TRANSPORTATION USED TO GET TO MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS BY AREA

	PENETANG/BROCKVILLE		COOKS/ATH/BRUCE MINES		S.S. MARIE/WINDSOR		TORONTO	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Walk	(22)	15	(30)	19	(17)	7	(41)	16
Drive Self	(76)	52	(76)	48	(112)	43	(65)	25
Driven by Spouse	(20)	14	(16)	10	(24)	9	(26)	10
Driven by Relatives	(17)	11	(26)	17	(40)	16	(30)	12
Driven by Friends	(1)	1	(4)	3	(7)	3	(8)	3
Taxi	(7)	5	-	-	(17)	6	(12)	5
Public Transportation	(2)	1	(1)	1	(39)	15	(69)	27
Community Agency	(1)	1	(5)	2	(2)	1	(2)	2
TOTAL	(146)*	100	(158)**	100	(258)***	100	(256)****	100

*2 Missing Observations, **10 Missing Observations, ***7 Missing Observations, ****7 Missing Observations

TABLE 5:

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE TWO MODES OF TRANSPORTATION USED TO GO TO SOCIAL OCCASIONS

	FIRST MODE (N)	%	SECOND MODE (N)	%
Walk	(86)	12	(24)	8
Drive Self	(326)	46	(30)	11
Driven by Spouse	(81)	11	(41)	14
Driven by Relatives	(80)	11	(53)	19
Driven by Friends	(52)	7	(48)	17
Taxi	(11)	2	(34)	12
Public Transportation	(75)	10	(52)	18
Community Agency	(2)	1	(3)	1
TOTAL	(713)*	100	(285)**	100

*133 Missing Observations

**533 Respondents Listed One Mode of Transportation
28 Missing Observations

TABLE 6: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE FIRST MODE OF TRANSPORTATION USED TO GO TO SOCIAL OCCASIONS BY AREA

	PENETANG/BROCKVILLE		COOKS/ATH/BRUCE MINES		S.S. MARIE/WINDSOR		TORONTO	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Walk	(16)	13	(24)	17	(23)	10	(23)	10
Drive Self	(70)	59	(76)	54	(105)	47	(75)	33
Driven by Spouse	(17)	14	(16)	11	(20)	9	(28)	12
Driven by Relatives	(6)	5	(14)	10	(36)	16	(24)	11
Driven by Friends	(5)	4	(10)	7	(17)	7	(20)	8
Taxi	(4)	3	-	-	(3)	1	(4)	2
Public Transportation	(1)	2	(1)	1	(19)	9	(54)	23
Community Agency	-	-	-	-	(1)	1	(1)	1
TOTAL	(119)*	100	(141)**	100	(224)***	100	(229)****	200

*29 Missing Cases, **27 Missing Cases, ***41 Missing Observations

**** 36 Missing Observations

TABLE 7: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS BY AREA

PROBLEMS WITH TRANSPORTATION TO:	PENETANG/BROCKVILLE (N)	%	COOK/ATH/BRUCE MINES (N)	%	S.S.MARIE/WINDSOR (N)	%	TORONTO (N)	%
Shopping	(12)	8	(8)	5	(7)	3	(21)	3
Medical Appointments	(13)	9	(5)	3	(4)	2	(17)	7
Social Activities	(10)	8	(6)	4	(7)	3	(11)	5

TABLE 8: TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS EXPRESSED BY RESPONDENTS WITH RESPECT TO GOING SHOPPING, GOING TO MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS AND GOING TO SOCIAL OCCASIONS (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	PROBLEMS WITH TRANSPORTATION RELATED TO:					
	SHOPPING		MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS		SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Public Transportation Inconvenience	(7)	15	(4)	10	(4)	12
Transportation Expensive	(3)	6	(3)	8	(1)	3
Unable To Use Public Transportation	(4)	8	(3)	8	-	-
No Public Transportation	(3)	6	(2)	5	(4)	12
No Person To Ask	(26)	53	(23)	59	(20)	61
Dislikes Depending On Others	(6)	12	(4)	10	(4)	12
TOTAL	(49)	100	(39)	100	(33)*	100

*1 Missing Observation

TABLE 9: NUMBER OF INTERFERING HEALTH CONDITIONS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS BY THEIR TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS WITH TRANSPORTATION
(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	NUMBER OF INTERFERING HEALTH CONDITIONS									
	1		2		2-3		4-5		6+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
No Transportation Problems	(240)	97	(144)	91	(196)	93	(92)	90	(82)	74
Transportation Problems	(7)	3	(15)	9	(15)	7	(10)	10	(29)	26
TOTAL*	(247)	100	(159)	100	(211)	100	(102)	100	(111)	100

Chi Square = 51.43 $P < .01$

*16 Missing Observations

TABLE 10: MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR PROBLEMS WITH TRANSPORTATION (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MARITAL STATUS							
	SINGLE		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED/ SEPARATED	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
No Transportation Problems	(51)	86	(433)	93	(237)	88	(28)	85
Transportation Problems	(8)	14	(32)	7	(33)	12	(5)	15
TOTAL*	(59)	100	(465)	100	(270)	100	(33)	100

Chi Square = 7.29 P < .05

*9 Missing Observations

TABLE 11: REASONS FOR NOT USING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BY AREA (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	PENETANG/ BROCKVILLE (N)	%	COOKS/ATH/ BRUCE MINES (N)	%	S.S. MARIE/ WINDSOR (N)	%	TORONTO (N)	%
No Need for Public Transportation	(72)	66	(66)	58	(116)	85	(27)	56
Too Expensive	-	-	(2)	2	(3)	2	-	-
Not Conveniently located	(4)	3	(10)	9	(2)	2	(4)	8
Needs Assistance and has None	(7)	6	(4)	4	(8)	5	(14)	28
Unable to Use It	(4)	4	(4)	4	(5)	4	(4)	8
No Public Transportation	(23)	21	(27)	23	(2)	2	-	-
TOTAL	(110)*	100	(113)	100	(136)**	100	(49)	100

*3 Missing Observations
**6 Missing Observations

TABLE 12: SEX OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MEN		WOMEN	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Used Public Transportation	(146)	42	(270)	57
Did Not Use Public Transportation	(206)	58	(204)	43
TOTAL*	(352)	100	(474)	100

Chi Square = 18.76 $P < .01$

*10 Missing Observations

TABLE 13: MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MARITAL STATUS							
	SINGLE		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED/ SEPARATED	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Used Public Transportation	(44)	73	(192)	41	(163)	60	(19)	58
Did Not Use Public Transportation	(16)	27	(274)	59	(110)	40	(14)	42
TOTAL*	(60)	100	(466)	100	(273)	100	(33)	100

Chi Square = 38.52 $P < .01$

*4 Missing Observations

TABLE 14: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORT THAT THE LOCATION OF THEIR RESIDENCE IS TOO DISTANT FROM TRANSPORTATION

AREA		(N)	%
Penetanguishene/Brockville	(n=148)	(23)	16
Cookstown/Athens/Bruce Mines	(n=168)	(21)	36
Sault Ste. Marie/Windsor	(n=252)	(19)	8
Toronto	(n=264)	(114)	5

TABLE 15: AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR WILLINGNESS TO SPEND ADDITIONAL INCOME ON TRANSPORTATION (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	AGE GROUP					
	65 - 74		75 - 84		85+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Would Spend Additional Income On Transportation	(179)	37	(66)	25	(9)	15
Would Not Spend Additional Income On Transportation	(301)	63	(200)	75	(51)	85
TOTAL*	(480)	100	(266)	100	(60)	100

Chi Square = 20.54 $P < .01$

*30 Missing Observations

TABLE 16:

SEX OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR WILLINGNESS TO SPEND ADDITIONAL INCOME ON TRANSPORTATION (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MEN		WOMEN	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Would Spend Additional Income On Transportation	(122)	36	(131)	28
Would Not Spend Additional Income On Transportation	(219)	64	(329)	72
TOTAL*	(341)	100	(460)	100

Chi Square = 4.50 $P < .05$

*35 Missing Observations

TABLE 17:

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR WILLINGNESS TO SPEND ADDITIONAL INCOME ON TRANSPORTATION
(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	SINGLE		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED/ SEPARATED	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Would Spend Additional Income On Transportation	(17)	30	(158)	35	(64)	24	(15)	46
Would Not Spend Additional Income On Transportation	(39)	70	(296)	65	(199)	76	(18)	54
TOTAL*	(56)	100	(454)	100	(263)	100	(33)	100

Chi Square = 11.56 $P < .01$

*30 Missing Observations

APPENDIX

OTHER PAPERS IN USCO SERIES

The data which was gathered in the USCO survey provides base line information on the living situation of senior citizens who are not living in institutions in the province of Ontario. The volume and comprehensiveness of the data demanded separate analysis to allow for clear and complete information regarding the association between variables. A series of papers resulted with each paper having a particular emphasis.

Within the series, seven papers are issue oriented:

1. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Health Status and Use of the Health Care System.
2. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Social Contacts, Providers of Assistance and Requests for Additional Assistance.
3. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Participation as Volunteers and Their Interest in Volunteerism.
4. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Use of Transportation.
5. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Potential and Actual Use of Community Services.
6. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Current Housing Situation and Their Interest in Various Housing Options.
7. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Participation in Leisure Activities and The Barriers to Their Participation.

Six papers provide profiles of subgroups within the population surveyed:

8. Elderly Residents in Ontario: The Experience of Those Who are Childless.
9. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Age Differences With Particular Focus on Persons Aged 85+.
10. Elderly Residents in Ontario: The Experiences of Those Who Are Frail.
11. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Differences By Marital Status With Particular Focus on Those Who Are Single.

12. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Income Group Differences.

13. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Rural-Urban Differences.

The series also includes:

14. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Study Methodology: a paper outlining the background of the study and the research methods employed.

15. Elderly Residents in Ontario: An Overview: a paper summarizing the findings and content of the other fourteen papers in the series.

The intention is that each of the fifteen papers in the series can be studied on its own but, also that the complete series will offer continuity and comprehensive information in an accessible form.

Additional copies of this report, and others in the series, are available in person from the Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario;

or, by mail through contacting:

Publications Services
5th Floor, 880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

In Ontario call toll free 1-800-268-7540; or, from area code 807 ask the Operator for Zenith 6-7200.

APPENDIX

GLOSSARY

Chi Square: a test of statistical significance which is used to determine whether variables are independent or related and to also determine the extent to which the relationship is systematic and is not just occuring by chance.

Cleaning: a method by which the data is systematically examined to identify and eliminate inappropriate codes and wild punches (key punching errors).

Coding: a method of transforming information from the interview schedule into a numerical scheme for purposes of data analysis. The codes are subsequently key punched onto a computer card and fed into the computer for analysis.

Community Agency/ Service: all health, social, legal and financial services available in a community and organized under public or voluntary auspices. The services may operate with or without paid staff, and may or may not charge the user for services rendered.

Cross Tabulations: a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables. The cross tabulations allow for statistical analysis using a test of significance such as the chi-square test.

Data: the information gathered in the study. In this project it consists of information gathered from the 846 interviews.

Dependent Variable: the outcome or determined condition in a relationship between two or more variables.

Disability: the requirement for assistance or the inability to carry out activities related to day to day living (i.e., housework, meal preparation.)

Frail: reports of three or more disabilities was the basis for defining a person as frail.

Frequencies: descriptive statistics used to organize data. The information is divided into variable categories or intervals and the number of cases in each category is known as the 'frequency' for that variable. The relative frequency is calculated by computing the percentage represented by the number of cases in each variable category.

Friendly Visiting: a community service wherein the individual receives personal visits from another person. This service may be organized under public or voluntary auspices and its purpose is to provide seniors with friendly contact.

G.I.S.: Guaranteed Income Supplement - a federal government supplement given to seniors to ensure that their income is at a specified level.

GAINS-A: Ontario provincial income supplement for senior citizens.

Health Care System: family physicians, specialists, hospitalizations, nursing home or rehabilitation centres.

Home Care: a program of visiting health care services to people in their own homes who meet eligibility criteria as established by the Ontario Ministry of Health.

Independent Variables: the determining condition in a relationship of two or more variables.

Institutional Settings: nursing homes, homes for the aged, chronic care units in general hospitals or chronic care hospitals, special care facilities and mental health facilities.

Instrument: the tool used to gather data; in this case the tool was an interview schedule.

Interfering Health Conditions: health conditions identified by a physician which the respondents consider to interfere with their day to day activities.

Interview Schedule: the questionnaire used by the interviewer to ask questions and record information.

Leisure Activity: an activity which a person participates in by choice and of their own volition; includes recreational activities, hobbies, volunteer work, etc.

Mean ($\bar{X}$): the sum of all the observations divided by the number of observations.

Missing Observations: instances in which the information is not available for a particular question.

Multiple Response: a procedure done on the computer with the use of SPSS whereby a analysis can be done of questions to which the respondents might legitimately make more than one reply.

OARS ADL Scale: specific questions developed for OARS (Older American Resources and Service Program of the Duke University Centre for the Study of Aging and Human Development). The ADL Scale measures the ability of respondents to carry out the activities of daily living (ADLS), (i.e., use of the telephone and meal preparation).

Old Age Security Data Base: a complete listing of all persons aged 62+ who receive the Old Age Security Pension and the Spouse's Allowance.

Paid Help: distinguished from a community service in that it is assistance received which is not organized under public auspices as a service. It is all other assistance for which a fee is paid.

Personal Care Activities: activities such as bathing, dressing and getting in and out of bed.

Pretest: the testing of a research instrument such as a questionnaire or interview schedule prior to actually administering it for a study. The purpose of a pretest is to see how the instrument actually works in the field. The extent to which the questions are understood and the ease with which the instrument is administered is examined.

Previously Married: individuals who were married but are not presently married due to being widowed, divorced or separated.

Random Sample: a process for sample selection in which every element in the population is given an equal chance of being picked.

Represenativeness: the degree to which the study sample represents the population at large. Specific characteristics such as sex and age can be compared to determine the representativeness.

S.D.: a statistic which measures the scatter of a set of data and indicates the extent to which the responses vary around the mean.

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences is a system of computer programs for the purpose of data analysis.

Sample: part of the population at large, selected for study.

Sample Frame: the base from which a sample is drawn, i.e., list of names.

Significant Differences: determined through a statistical procedure to establish that the relationship between variables did not occur by chance.

Single: persons who have never been married or are not living common-law.

Social Contacts: visits with friends and family or in person.

Socio-Economic: characteristics frequently used to measure social status such as educational level or income.

Stratified Sample: a sample procedure whereby all individuals are divided into groups or categories (in the case of this study it was communities) and then an independent sample is selected within each group or stratum.)

Supportive Housing Arrangements: a housing arrangement in which some supportive services are available, such as meals, house cleaning.

Tau: Kendal's Tau: a statistic used to measure the association among ordinal data. It summarizes the relationship between variables.

Variable: refers to a particular characteristic of the sample being considered.

Volunteer: a person who gives his/her time to a particular cause or organization without pay.

References

Atchley, Robert C. The Social Forces in Later Life
Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc., 1977.

Carp, Frances M. "The Mobility of Retired People, " in
Kalish, Richard A. (ed). The Later Years: Social
Applications of Gerontology
Monterey, Ca.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1977.
pp. 269-280

Cutler, Stephen J. "Transportation and Changes in Life
Satisfaction" in Seltzer, M.; Corbett, S. and Atchley, R.
(eds). Social Problems of the Aging
Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1978
pp. 226-236